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The 1nc impact is kinda old but it’s a classic that is necessary for your development as debaters --- feel free to swap it for Royal etc.

### \*\*\*1nc

#### Credit ratings agencies agree that the U.S. budget deficit is stable now

Puzzanghera 14, Jim is a staff writer at the Los Angeles Times, 3/21/14, Fitch takes U.S. credit rating off downgrade watch after debt deal, http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-mo-fitch-credit-rating-debt-limit-20140321-story.html

"Strong fiscal consolidation has been achieved," Fitch said, a reference to the automatic spending cuts known as the sequester that began last year.

The budget deficit fell to 4% of GDP last year from 6.7% the previous year and 9.8% in 2009, Fitch said. This fiscal year, the company forecasts the deficit to shrink to 2.9% of so-called gross domestic product.

A recent two-year budget deal was a sign "there has been some improvement in the coherence of economic policy-making" in Washington, Fitch said. Still, the firm does not expect a broader "grand bargain" on long-term deficit reduction until after the 2016 presidential election.

Fitch described the prospects for U.S. economic growth as "more robust" than many other advanced nations. It forecast the economy would expand by 2.8% this year after a 1.9% increase in 2013.

In other positive signs, Fitch said the Federal Reserve had started to reduce its stimulus efforts, the U.S. banking system was healthy and dividend payments from seized housing finance giants Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac had offset the cost of their bailouts.

Last summer, Moody's upgraded its outlook for the U.S. credit rating to stable, citing the shrinking budget deficit and improved economy.

S&P also shifted its outlook to stable from negative in June for similar reasons, but warned the U.S. was still years away from regaining its AAA rating.

#### (((Insert Specific Link)))

#### Only continued spending cuts avert a downgrade

**Newman 13** (US News. Rick Newman is an award-winning finance columnist for US news. “What Will Cause the Next U.S. Credit Downgrade.” Jan. 3, 2013. <https://www.google.com/search?sourceid=chrome-psyapi2&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8&q=%22rick%20newman%20is%22>.)

A failure to cut spending in 2013. Just about everybody agrees that **Washington** still **has to axe hundreds of billions in annual spending to stabilize its finances**. Some hope it will happen as part of a deal to extend the debt ceiling. The problem is that most government spending actually benefits somebody—seniors, home buyers, the poor, defense contractors—and Congress has proven itself particularly reluctant to reduce anybody's benefits. **Moody's wants to see spending cuts,** and perhaps even more tax hikes, **as part of a big budget deal** in the first few months of 2013 **that would** convincingly **improve the government's long-term finances.** **"The debt** trajectory **resulting from this process is likely to determine whether the Aaa rating is returned to a stable outlook or downgraded," Moody's said** in a statement following the January 1 fiscal-cliff deal. **If Congress continually delays spending cuts**—the habit in recent years—**a downgrade could come** by summer.

#### That collapses the global economy

Hill 13 [Patrice, Washington Times. Patrice Hill is the chief economics correspondent for the Washington Times. “With U.S. fiscal problems unresolved, treasured AAA rating may fall off cliff” http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/jan/7/us-fiscal-problems-unresolved-aaa-rating-may-drop/?page=all]

Despite the indifference in some parts of Washington, analysts say this time could be different and that a second downgrade by Moody’s or Fitch has the potential to cause significant market turmoil and damage the country’s privileged financial status, which includes the lowest government borrowing rates in the world and the many prerogatives that go with printing the world’s main reserve currency, the U.S. dollar. Rebound would be difficult Economic analysts say that, once lost, it would be difficult for the U.S. to regain its top rating, and the move would confirm in the eyes of much of the world that the U.S. is slowly sliding into second-tier economic status. “The next step is a very serious cliff that involves the credit rating of the U.S. It doesn’t get more serious than that, and one hopes that will cause some to be more responsible than they might otherwise be,” said David Kelleher, president of Better Markets Inc. and a former Senate Democratic aide. “Unfortunately, the last debate over the debt ceiling in 2011 doesn’t give much hope.” The downgrade in August 2011 provoked a major drop in consumer and business confidence and prompted a dizzying drop of more than 600 points in the Dow Jones industrial average the day it happened. But the impact proved to be transient, with most losses recouped within a matter of weeks or months, leading many in Washington to question whether another downgrade will have any lasting significance or effect. “Plus, there are too many saying they are going to hold the credit rating of the U.S. hostage to their policy preferences,” Mr. Kelleher said. “If politicians aren’t careful, they could actually make everything much worse.” Sounding the alarm Some in Congress — mostly Republicans — agree that Washington should be worried about the next downgrade. “America cannot afford for Moody’s alarm to fall on deaf ears,” said Rep. Tim Huelskamp, Kansas Republican. “In 2011, Washington was given ample notice that America’s stellar credit rating was on thin ice, but Washington passed on the opportunity to deliver a solution. Unfortunately for America, the so-called fiscal cliff legislation was another last-minute deal instead of a real solution. There were consequences for inaction last time, and clearly there will be consequences this time around as well.” But skepticism that Washington will rise to the occasion also is plentiful. Liberal groups such as the Economic Policy Institute, a labor-backed think-tank, argue that there is little need to cut the deficit with Treasury’s 10-year borrowing rates at all-time lows of less than 2 percent. They say the U.S. should take advantage of such low rates and increase spending on infrastructure, unemployment benefits and other economic stimulus programs. “Some respected voices on the left believe that a focus on the deficit is an overblown reaction to a manageable problem,” said David Hollingsworth, adviser for the Third Way, a centrist Democratic group that is pushing for further measures to reduce the deficit. “They argue that if our debt was really a big deal, investors wouldn’t be supplying us with capital so cheaply.” Robert Shapiro, an economic adviser in the Clinton administration, advocates additional measures to gradually reduce spending on entitlement programs and bring down the deficit, but he blames the last downgrade on Republicans, not Democrats, and said it could happen again if conservatives insist on coupling an increase in the debt limit with unpopular spending reforms. “The last time that House and Senate hyper-conservatives went down that path, it cost the U.S. government its triple-A rating from one of the three major credit-rating agencies,” he said, suggesting that Democrats will try to pin any further downgrades on Republicans if it happens again this year, and to use it to political advantage. “Any political leader or party that helps to bring about such a catastrophe will prove themselves unfit to govern for a very long time,” he said. Wall Street worries The growing intransigence on the left and right has led many on Wall Street and Main Street to question whether another agreement delivering more budget cuts will emerge from the latest round of negotiations. Tom Porcelli, chief economist at RBC Capital Markets, said he expects Republicans to fight hard for spending cuts that eluded them in last week’s deal, but the outcome is in doubt. “In the absence of a grand bargain in the next two months, it is likely that the U.S. is downgraded,” he said. “And this downgrade is likely to have a more significant market impact than the S&P downgrade,” because it will force investment funds around the world to reshuffle the securities in their portfolios to ensure they are maintaining AAA or other targeted rating levels, he said. This will cause widespread disruptions in global markets as investors recalibrate their portfolios, causing a “cascade effect” on assets other than Treasurys, he said. John Browne, senior economic consultant at Euro Pacific Capital, said the damage from further downgrades would affect the U.S. status in the economic world for a long time. The U.S. dollar is the world’s dominant currency, he said, because debt troubles in the eurozone have tarnished the appeal of the euro, which had been ascending as a replacement for the dollar in the past decade. “This privileged position has conferred on Washington the vital element of time to organize viable revisions to its entitlements,” whose uncontrolled growth is at the root of the U.S. debt problem, he said. But political leaders appear to be “squandering” the luxury of time they got from the ongoing European debt crisis, he said. “The spectacle of American politicians failing to agree on budgets, spending limits or any type of fiscal discipline can affect the credit rating of the U.S. Over the longer term, a major fall in the credit rating is likely to increase U.S. interest rates,” he said. But perhaps the greatest impact is to the U.S. reputation. “The blatant dereliction of duty on display in Washington will diminish national prestige,” Mr. Browne said.

#### Extinction

Mead 92 Walter Russell Mead, fellow, Council on Foreign Relations, New perspectives quarterly, summer 1992 p. 28

But what if it can't? What if the global economy stagnates - or even shrinks? In that case, we will face a new period of international conflict: South against North, rich against poor. Russia, China, India - these countries with their billions of people and their nuclear weapons will pose a much greater danger to world order than Germany and Japan did in the '30s.

## Uniqueness

### 2nc Uq --- Fiscal Discipline

#### There’s Congressional commitment to fiscal discipline --- the left and right agree

Hungerford 4/8, Thomas L. Hungerford, EPI’s Director of Tax and Budget Policy, Testimony before the House Committee on Ways and Means, http://www.epi.org/publication/testimony-house-committee-ways-means/

Concern over our long-term fiscal challenges appears to have made long-term fiscal discipline the order of the day. For example, congressional budget proposals, such as the Congressional Progressive Caucus’s budget proposal and Mr. Ryan’s budget proposal, lay out policies that would reduce budget deficits and federal debt over the 10-year budget window, albeit in very different ways.

#### Revenues increasing and the debt’s declining

AP 6/11, Federal budget deficit for May put at $130 billion, <http://www.buffalonews.com/business/federal-budget-deficit-for-may-put-at-130-billion-20140611>

The improvement this year reflects a stronger economy and labor market, which translates into more income and higher tax revenues. The government has also trimmed spending to gain control of soaring deficits in recent years.

Revenues this year totaled $1.93 trillion through May, up 7.5 percent from the same period a year ago. Government spending over this period totaled $2.37 trillion, a drop of 2.3 percent from a year ago.

#### No, seriously, we have the lowest deficit in 5 years

Klimasinska 10/30, Kasia is a staff writer at Bloomberg, Budget Deficit in U.S. Narrows to 5-Year Low on Record Revenue, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-10-30/budget-deficit-in-u-s-narrows-to-5-year-low-on-record-revenue.html

The U.S. posted its smallest budget deficit in five years as employment gains helped propel revenue to a record.

Spending exceeded receipts by $680.3 billion in the 12 months ended Sept. 30, the narrowest gap since 2008, compared with a $1.09 trillion shortfall in fiscal 2012, the Treasury Department said today in Washington. In September, the U.S. recorded a $75.1 billion surplus, little changed from the surplus in the same month a year earlier.

### ---2nc Uq --- Fiscal Discipline --- AT: Current Spending

#### Even though we’re still deep in debt corrective action is mitigating the impact

Epstein 6/14, Gene Epstein is a staff writer at Barrons, A Mixed Bag of News for the Federal Budget, http://online.barrons.com/news/articles/SB50001424053111903583804579614251090026972

Start with the good news. The federal budget is still bleeding red ink, but the hemorrhaging is occurring at a slower rate.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office recently updated the federal government's fiscal report card through May. As of the first eight months of the 2014 fiscal year, which began last October, the budget deficit ran $439 billion, $188 billion less than the same eight-month period a year ago.

This 30% decline was due to a combination of higher receipts (up 7%) and lower outlays (down 2%). Most of the gain on the revenue side came from greater amounts of cash withheld from paychecks that cover wages and salaries: up $76 billion, or 6%. Estimated tax payments also rose by $19 billion, or 5%, while revenues were further boosted by a decline of $1 billion, or 1%, in income-tax refunds.

### ---2nc Uq --- Downgrade --- AT: Non-Debt Issues

#### Debt’s the biggest issue

USA Today 13, Fitch may downgrade U.S. credit rating, http://www.usatoday.com/story/money/business/2013/01/15/fitch-downgrade-us/1835385/

Other factors Fitch says support the U.S.'s AAA rating are the country's economic dynamism, lower financial sector risks, the rule of law as well as the global benchmark status of the country's bonds and the dollar.

However it says these "fundamental credit strengths are being eroded by the large, albeit steadily declining, structural budget deficit and high and rising public debt."

### 2nc Uniqueness --- Fitch

#### The federal AAA credit rating with Fitch is stable now

Puzzanghera 14, Jim is a staff writer at the Los Angeles Times, 3/21/14, Fitch takes U.S. credit rating off downgrade watch after debt deal, http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-mo-fitch-credit-rating-debt-limit-20140321-story.html

WASHINGTON -- Fitch Ratings on Friday upgraded its outlook for the U.S. AAA credit rating, removing the nation from a downgrade watch after politicians put off another debt limit battle until next year.

The company, one of three major credit rating firms, changed the outlook for the rating to stable from a negative watch put in place in October.

### 2nc AT: Uq Overwhelms/No Downgrade

#### The credit rating is stable but uncertainty remains

Detrixhe 4/22, John is a staff writer at Bloomberg, U.S. Credit-Rating Outlook Changed to Stable by DBRS, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2014-04-22/u-s-credit-rating-outlook-changed-to-stable-by-dbrs.html

The negative outlook on the U.S.’s AAA credit-ranking was changed to stable by DBRS Inc. amid declining federal budget deficits and after Congress suspended the nation’s debt limit earlier this year until 2015.

The Toronto-based ratings company’s adjustment follows decisions by Moody’s Investors Service and Standard & Poor’s last year to change their outlooks on the U.S. to stable from negative. S&P stripped the nation of its top grade in August 2011, citing, in part, political discord about the debt limit. Moody’s gives the nation its top Aaa grade.

The issuer of the world’s reserve currency avoided a downgrade from DBRS, which confirmed its AAA rating. Stronger economic growth is forecast by a government agency to reduce the budget deficit to a seven-year low as a share of the economy.

“Uncertainty over future political cooperation remains, especially given congressional elections this November,” the ratings company said today in a statement. “DBRS considers a selective default to be unlikely given the repercussions on the political parties, on investor sentiment and on the economic recovery.”

#### The reason we’re not about to be downgraded is because we stopped wasteful spending! Return to the old dynamics guarantees economic collapse and downgrade

Tanner 13, Overrated Debt Ceiling, Michael Tanner is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute and author of Leviathan on the Right: How Big-Government Conservatism Brought Down the Republican Revolution, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/overrated-debt-ceiling

But none of this would be worse than a failure to take meaningful action to reduce the debt, federal spending, and the growth of government. Indeed, if we want to see more credit downgrades, market turmoil, and slow growth, all we need do is continue on our present course.

#### That is why all three major agencies have a positive outlook – means the link controls the internal link

Foley 3/21, Megan Foley is a staff writer at Wall Street Cheat Sheet, http://wallstcheatsheet.com/politics/crisis-passed-fitch-removes-u-s-credit-downgrade-warning.html/?a=viewall

Fitch has also forecast that the deficit will continue to decline in the coming years, dipping to 2.9 percent this fiscal year and 2.6 percent in the 2015 fiscal year. To be fair, Portman referred to overall government debt — which is growing — when making his dire prediction, while Fitch’s analysis only touched on yearly budget shortfalls. Still, it’s significant that Portman described the United States’ economic future as a slow-motion train wreck, and Fitch stated that growth prospects are robust and “demographic trends less worrisome than in many advanced country peers.” The ratings firm expects the country’s GDP to expand by 2.8 percent this year, which follows 2013’s 1.9 percent increase.

Last June, S&P shifted its rating from negative, citing the shrinking budget deficit and improved economy. But the firm maintained that the U.S. is still years away from its AAA rating. Meanwhile, last summer, Moody’s upgraded its outlook for the U.S. credit rating to stable also thanks to the shrinking budget deficit and improved economy

#### 2011 wasn’t an off event – there’s a continuous risk of downgrade

USA Today 13, Fitch may downgrade U.S. credit rating, http://www.usatoday.com/story/money/business/2013/01/15/fitch-downgrade-us/1835385/

"The pressure on the U.S. rating, if anything, is increasing," David Riley, managing director of Fitch Ratings' global sovereigns division said at a London conference. "We thought the 2011 crisis was a one-off event …. if we have a repeat we will place the U.S. rating under review."

## Link

### Arctic Ships

#### Fiat means the aff happens immediately before the review process is over --- guarantees skyrocketing cost overruns

Maritime Press 12, Shipbuilding director announces update, http://newsletter.maasmondmaritime.com/pdf/2012/255-11-09-2012.pdf

"If we were cutting steel right now it would not be a good thing because we would be cutting it against an incomplete design," said Finn, "and that's pretty much a guarantee for waste and rework." How many arctic vessels get built will depend on the cost and final design. Irving engineers are now reviewing the government's preliminary design as part of a process to avoid skyrocketing cost overruns plaguing projects like the Cyclone helicopters.

### 1nc Link --- Offshore Wind

#### Offshore wind is expensive --- their ev doesn’t assume massive maintenance costs

Breton 8– department of Civil and Transport Engineering and Norwegian University of Science and Technology (Simon-Philippe, “Status, plans, and Technologies for Offshore Wind Turbines in Europe and North America” http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960148108002243)

Several challenges are, however, met by offshore wind energy. Higher investments in towers, foundations and underwater cabling are needed, and installation is more difficult and expensive offshore. Offshore wind energy is also as of now 1.5–2 times more expensive than onshore. A long planning phase including among others environmental, engineering, feasibility and site-specific studies is required, and in some areas competition with other marine users will be a problem as well. Access to the offshore sites for maintenance and repair is also a major concern. Simple problems that could be fixed instantly and at low costs onshore require a time-consuming logistical system, and may suffer unpredictable delays due to adverse weather conditions. Repairs are an estimated 5–10 times more expensive to perform offshore than onshore, mainly due to the need for expensive crane vessels, and waiting periods for suitable weather conditions can be extremely costly. In some cases, even for a turbine located only 1 km offshore, a period as long as two weeks can pass without access to the site for repair being possible. It was recently estimated for a park off the coast of Ireland that the turbines are reachable for repair only about 50–75% of the time when looking at the whole year. Such limited access rates for repair and maintenance leads to lower production time for offshore turbines, thus affecting the economics of the parks. Availability of the turbines is expected to go down for locations submitted to harsher environmental conditions, and as distance from the shore increases. An example of difficulties following from access issues was the experiences by Vestas in the Horns Rev wind farm off the coast of Denmark. After problems were found with some of the turbines generators and transformers, Vestas decided to change these components in all the 80 turbines of the park. Access to the site was then a major issue, and it was decided to remove all the nacelles and bring them onshore for repair, which was very costly, and during which time the park could not be in operation. One conclusion from this experience and from other wind parks is that the wind turbine technology should be proven before turbines are taken offshore.

### 2nc XT: Offshore Wind Link

#### Offshore wind energy expensive for a myriad of factors

US Offshore Wind Collaborative Organizing Group 5 **–** A leader in offshore wind development. The Collaborative’s Board of Directors and Program Partners include national leaders in government, industry, academia, and environmental advocacy (“A Framework for Offshore Wind Energy Development in the US” http://www.usowc.org/pdfs/final\_09\_20.pdf)

European offshore wind project costs generally range between $0.08 and $0.15 per kilowatt-hour, which is almost double that of onshore projects. Construction and accessibility, which are the leading cost drivers, are much more difficult at sea. For example, the majority of the cost of an offshore wind project is attributable to its balance of plant components, including the foundation/support structure, installation, and transmission, as opposed to an onshore project, where most of the costs reside with the wind turbines. The high construction costs for offshore development make cost reduction, particularly in the balance of plant components, a key component of achieving competitive offshore wind energy development.

### 1nc Link --- Remote Sensing

#### NPOESS proves the cost will balloon

Joint Ocean Committee 6, APPROPRIATIONS: Senate panel boosts ocean, fisheries research at NOAA, http://www.jointoceancommission.org/news-room/in-the-news/2006-07-14\_Senate\_panel\_boosts\_ocean\_&\_fisheries\_research\_at\_NOAA@E&E\_Daily.pdf

Conceived in 1994 as a cost-saving successor to separate civilian and military weather satellites, NPOESS has seen its budget balloon from $6.5 billion to $11.5 billion and scheduled launch dates slip by years. Earlier this month, the Pentagon completed a budgetary review of the program, mandated under the Nunn-McCurdy Act when NPOESS budget overruns hit 25 percent of the original cost estimate.

### 2nc XT: Remote Sensing Link

#### Remote sensors are expensive

**Borre et al 11 –** Jeroen Vanden Borre, Desire Paelinckx, and Geert De Blust are members of the Research Institute for Nature of Forest; Lammert Kooistra is part of the Wageningen University Centre for Geo-Information; Birgen Haest is from the Flemish Institute for Technological Research (“Integrating remote sensing in Natura 2000 habitat monitoring” http://ac.els-cdn.com/S1617138110000567/1-s2.0-S1617138110000567-main.pdf?\_tid=d9b83246-fd85-11e3-8c23-00000aacb361&acdnat=1403823887\_13d3e48e8f2370263a6b5330778136a0)

Development of readily useful products with readily available data **In recent years, nature conservation administrations have been faced with high data needs over short time. Some monitoring experts have looked into the possibilities offered by remote sensing, but noticed that many of these products are still in an early development phase, and that it will require many more years to reach a fully operational phase. They feel that an important reason for this is in the desire of remote sensing scientists to contribute to technological progress in their own specialisms. Such cutting-edge science very often makes use of** new and expensive sensors **and methods, for which the large scale applicability in the near future still** needs to be demonstrated. These users suggest that remote sensing scientists should focus on developing products and services that fulﬁl the existent data needs, using imagery and technology that is and will be easily available now (e.g. Landsat) or in the near future (e.g. GMES Sentinel-2).

#### Ocean satellite mapping is expensive and risky

**Chao 08\***– Yi is a principal scientist for the Earth and Space Science Division at NASA and is the project scientist for the Aquarius satellite mission to measure the sea surface from space (“Satellite Oceanography” http://www.usc.edu/org/cosee-west/PDFs/CWestChaoJPL.pdf)

\*Date inferred from reference to events within article

Limitations of Satellite Oceanography **Satellite oceanography is** – technologically challenging: 1st satellite dedicated for oceanography in late 1970s – **at high cost: a single satellite costs** >$100M to build, and ~$50M to launch**;– at high risk: a satellite has a design lifetime of** 3 years**; it is not uncommon that a satellite failed within 3 years;** single point of failures• Satellite data have much larger errors simply because it is 100s miles away from the ocean surface• Satellite can only measure the ocean surface (except the upcoming laser technology)

#### Remote sensing satellites are expensive to the point where it impedes progress

**Congress 94 –** (“Civilian Remote Sensing: A Strategic Approach” https://www.princeton.edu/~ota/disk1/1994/9403/940305.PDF)

Inability to aggregate diffuse requirements. This happens when several agencies or other users have requirements for similar data, but none of those agencies can afford the satellite system needed to acquire those data. The difficulties in funding the Landsat system provide a clear example. Although many agencies use Landsat data, historically, no single agency has found its data needs compelling enough to fund a satellite system of its own. Because of this, responsibility for the Landsat program has shifted from agency to agency and still lacks the robustness that operational users need (chapter 3). Inefficiency in making tradeoffs between costs and requirements. The current requirements process often separates the phase of drawing up user requirements from the phase of engineering design. This separation makes it difficult for users and designers to discuss tradeoffs between requirements and costs.For example, a slight adjustment in requirements could result in a major reduction in cost, or a substantial improvement in capabilities could be accomplished at modest additional cost. Private industry has used this process of concurrent engineering to meet market demands more efficiently. 30 These tradeoffs can occur in operational programs through many iterations of the process of developing and refining requirements for successive generations of satellites but are harder to accomplish for new satellite systems. Several systems under development were later canceled because stated requirements led to unaffordable costs.31 Difficulty in establishing national priorities**.**The current institutional arrangement for meeting national priorities allows each agency to make tradeoffs among its own missions and budget constraints but provides no mechanism for establishing priorities and making tradeoffs among the programs of several agencies**.** The problem is especially acute when an agency is attempting to establish new missions and the budgets to carry them out. For example, NOAA may be the appropriate agency to pursue long-term monitoring of global change, but it currently lacks the budget to carry out that mission. Conversely, NASA has a substantial budget for research and development but no charter for long-term operational missions.Lack of agency expertise. The agency responsible for operating a satellite system may lack experience and expertise in the design of satellite systems. This has been true for NOAA, which relies on NASA for the development of new instruments. Partly for this reason, the ambitious requirements for GOES-Next led to significant delays and cost overruns that threatened the continuity of the GOES program.

#### Satellite remote sensing data is highly expensive

**Roughgarden et al 91 –** Joan Roughguard is an ecologist working at Stanford University; Running is an environmental scientist (“What Does Remote Sensing Do For Ecology?” http://www.jstor.org/stable/1941546)

In all of these examples, remote sensing has been used for detection of characteristics of interest in ecology, either to formulate or test hypotheses, or to aid in estimates of ecological processes on regional and global scales. This is not an exhaustive list, but there are not many more examples. At first glance, it seems strange that ecologists have failed to take better advantage of this tool, as they have taken advantage of other new tools such as isotope analysis and modelling. There are, however, a number of reasons why remote sensing technology has not made strong inroads in ecology yet, although these constraints are rapidly eroding. First, satellite remote sensing data are expensive; the privatized Landsat Thematic Mapper data cost $3900/ scene, Landsat Multi Spectral Scanner data cost $ 1 000/ scene, and French SPOT data is $1800/scene, although educational discounts of $600/scene are currently being offered. However, the United States Geological Survey EROS Data Center in South Dakota is finalizing a system to produce biweekly composited five-channel and NDVI AVHRR datasets of the United States for 1990 and North America for 1991. The 1990 datasets are available on five CD-ROMs (each with 800 Mbytes of data) for $32 each. Some satellite data is becoming available, effectively free, from centralized databanks accessible over high-speed computer networks.

### 1nc Link --- Ocean Power

#### Ocean power spends a ton

**Fehrenbacher 9** (Gigaom. Katie Fehrenbacher is a Senior Writer & Features Editor for GigaOM and has been covering cutting-edge technology, startups and innovators in Silicon Valley for close to a decade. “Why Wave and Tidal Power Are Lost At Sea — It's Darn Expensive.” http://gigaom.com/2009/06/08/why-wave-and-tidal-power-are-lost-at-sea-darn-expensive/)

Despite many companies’ best efforts, wave and tidal power installations have been largely stuck in the pilot stage — bigger projects in particular have faced technical glitches and a lack of funding. Tom Konrad over on AltEnergyStocks points out research done last year showing **ocean power’s most vulnerable point: It’s one of the most expensive clean energy generation options out there**. That’s according to a study developed last year by infrastructure **consulting firm Black and Veatch** (B&V) for the California Renewable Energy Transmission Initiative, a state initiative focused on research to build transmission lines for clean power. The report **says that** within California specifically, **wave and marine current power generation can cost as much as $445 per MWH** and $410 per MWH, respectively. **Other renewables** like wind, solid biomass, hydroelectric and geothermal **have clean energy generation costs nearing $150 per MWH**. It’s not ground-breaking info, but the chart shows how stark the difference is between ocean power and other forms of clean power generation.

### 1nc Link --- Renewables --- Environmental Review

#### Ocean renewables must submit to environmental reviews

Stosser 7, Michael Stosser is a Sr. Vice President and General Counsel Ardour Capital Investments, EBA CLIMATE CHANGE PRIMER: FINANCING A RENEWABLE PROJECT, http://felj.org/sites/default/files/docs/elj291/financing\_a\_renewable\_project.pdf

Moving up the scale of siting difficulty, one can also put wind projects in the ocean and there are some tidal projects being considered. Ocean wind and tidal project face the same types of concerns environmentally. One is concerned about bird or fish impacts. These projects may also raise aesthetics concerns, as in the case of the Massachusetts facility. These projects, however, have far more significant permitting requirements than solar or land based wind. These projects will trigger requirements for federal permits under section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act and section 404 of the Clean Water Act, section 404. These requirements, in turn, will trigger the requirements for a state water quality certification under section 401 of the Clean Water Act. The projects can implicate coastal zone management concerns and require NEPA compliance. They may trigger the need for an Endangered Species Act consultation. So these ocean projects will begin to drag in many more of the federal regulatory concerns and will require more upfront work.

#### That wastes resources on litigation, balloons program cost, delays the aff, and ultimately cancels the project --- vote neg on presumption

**Conrad and Sarwal 6** (Memebers of the chamber of commerce. Full Date: December 2006. Accessed: 7/12/12. http://www.scotusblog.com/movabletype/archives/06-466Chamber.pdf)

NEPA’s requirements are essentially procedural: An agency must take a “hard look” at potentially significant environmental effects of its proposed actions, but the Act does not purport to control the agency’s ultimate choices. See, e.g., Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC, 435 U.S. 519, 558 (1978). That procedural mandate has served an important role in correcting a situation in which agencies did not take sufficient account of environmental concerns. Over time, however, **both NEPA’s procedural requirements and, in particular, litigation challenging the adequacy of an agency’s NEPA compliance have also become “**notorious for special interest abuse**.”** Frank B. Cross, The Judiciary and Public Choice, 50 Hastings L. J. 355, 375 (1999). **An expansive judicial view of NEPA’s requirements, which first shapes action at the administrative level and then plays out in** follow-on litigation**, can** introduce significant costs and delay in obtaining agency action**—**costs and delay that are too often the only real ends of those who use NEPA to impose them. One commentator describes the phenomenon as follows: **Delay** buys time**, which opponents can use to** build popular and political opposition to the project**. New information may develop, partially through the dis-closures of the NEPA statement.** Inflationary pressures**, and** other costs**, could** economically doom the project during the delay**. NEPA thereby became an** important means to the end: stopping the project. Denis Binder, NEPA, NIMBYs and New Technology, 25 Land and Water Law Review 11, 17 (1990). See also, e.g., James Dao, **Environmental Groups to File Suit over Missile Defense**, N.Y. Times, Aug. 28, 2001, at A10 (reporting **plaintiff’s statement that “the hope is that [the NEPA-induced] delay will lead to cancellation…. That’s what we always hope for in these suits.**”); Daniel Ackman, Highway to Nowhere: NEPA, Environmental Review and the Westway Case, 21 Colum. L.J. & Soc. Probs. 325 (1988). In other words, **NEPA can easily become a tool of those interested in scuttling a project for any reason.**

## Link --- Generics/Tricks

### 1nc Link --- Ocean Exploration

**Ocean exploration is super expensive and leads to MISSION CREEP**

**Allen 06 –** Erica Allen is a graduate from Morehead State University (“The Voyage of the Deep Blue Sea” http://www.angelfire.com/planet/oceanexploration/erica\_allen/)

**To add to all the dangers of ocean exploration, it is also a very expensive adventure. According to the 2005 National Ocean Exploration Program Act “the bill would authorize the appropriation of $45 million annually for fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and $55 million annually for fiscal years 2012 through 2017”** (National). **This amount of money is major in deciding whether or not the ocean should be explored because the economy is at a very fluctuating state**. After September 11th the economy plunged, and it has just recently begun to gain strength and trust in Americans and other nations. **The amount of money the bill asks for is a grand amount—where will this money come from? There is a possibility that the money could come from taxpayers, and taxes could increase, causing Americans pocket books to suffer severely. Even by examining the amount of money needed for exploration during a fiscal year, it is even more outrageous when the calculations are added together. For the first five years of the program $225 million will be needed to successfully scope the floor. For the final five years $275 million dollars will be asked for. For the ten year program it would take $500 million dollars to begin a successful journey.** One more downfall to the amount of money is considering the fact that **after the ten years pass**, how much longer will be needed to finish the project, and **how much more money will need to be deposited into it?** One can conclude that the price of exploration outweighs the advantages of diving because diving can cause severe damage to the ocean and all of the sea creatures, and the prices are outrageously high. It is true that mysteries have the potential to be solved with ocean exploration, but what is really at stake? **Humans have conquered the natural world, and now humans wish to overpower the ocean as well. Over consumption led by humans resulted in the destruction of nature, and ocean exploration can possibly be one more example of this.**

### 2nc XT: Exploration Link

**Ocean exploration expensive**

**Carlyle 13 –** Ryan Carlyle, BSChE, Subsea Hydraulics Engineer (“Why Don’t We Spend More Time Exploring the Oceans, Rather than Space Exploration?” http://www.forbes.com/sites/quora/2013/01/31/why-dont-we-spend-more-on-exploring-the-oceans-rather-than-on-space-exploration/)

**I’m one hundred and twenty miles offshore in the Gulf of Mexico right now, working on installing seafloor equipment for an oil project. No one spends more time exploring the deepest oceans than the oil industry.** In the last twenty years, there has been a veritable explosion of deepwater exploration, with extensive subsea surveys for pipelines and anchors and oil well infrastructure. We have fantastic subsea robots that let us see and work down to 10,000 ft depth — as well as a host of seismic imaging systems to see below the seafloor, sonar, Doppler current sensors, monitoring buoys, and so forth. The equipment to explore the oceans exists today and is in routine use for energy exploration. For example:Remote Operated Vehicles (ROVs):Source: NEW DEEP-SWIMMING ROV HEADS FOR BRAZILTrench digger for burying subsea pipelines:Source: Subsea tractor to début in North Sea. So as someone whose job deals with exploring the ocean deeps — see my answer to Careers: What kinds of problems does a subsea hydraulics engineer solve? — **I can tell you that the ocean is excruciatingly boring. The vast majority of the seafloor once you get >50 miles offshore is barren, featureless mud**. On face, this is pretty similar to the empty expanses of outer space, but in space you can see all the way through the nothing, letting you identify targets for probes or telescopes. The goals of space exploration are visible from the Earth, so we can dream and imagine reaching into the heavens. But in the deep oceans, visibility is less than 100 feet and travel speed is measured in single-digit knots. **A simple seafloor survey to run a 100 mile pipeline costs a cool $50 million. The oceans are vast, boring, and difficult/expensive to explore** — so why bother? Sure, there are beautiful and interesting features like geothermal vents and coral reefs. But throughout most of the ocean these are few and far between. This is a pretty normal view from a subsea robot MBARI – Ridges 2005 Expedition Despite the difficulty, there is actually a lot of scientific exploration going on in the oceans. Here’s a pretty good public website for a science ROV mission offshore Oregon: 2009 Pacific Northwest ExpeditionTo reinforce my point about it being boring, here’s a blog entry from that team where they talk about how boring the sea floor is: 2009 Pacific Northwest Expedition What IS really interesting in the deep ocean is the exotic life. You see some crazy animals that are often not well-known to science. Something floats by the camera 5000 ft down, and you say “what the hell was that?” and no one knows. Usually it’s just some variety of jellyfish, but occasionally we find giant\* isopods Giant isopod\*This is a moderately small specimen. They have been recorded at 2.5 ft long.Or giant alien squid monsters:Unfortunately, deep-sea creatures rarely survive the trip to surface. Their bodies are acclimated to the high pressures (hundreds of atmospheres), and the decompression is usually fatal. Our ability to understand these animals is very limited, and their only connection to the surface biosphere is through a few food chain connections (like sperm whales) that can survive diving to these depths. We’re fundamentally quite disconnected from deep ocean life.A lso, there is no hope of ever establishing human habitation more than about 1000 ft deep. The pressures are too great, and no engineering or materials conceivable today would allow us to build livable-sized spaces on the deep sea floor. The two times humans have reached the deepest part of the ocean, it required a foot-thick flawless metal sphere with barely enough internal space to sit down. As far as I can tell, seafloor living is all but impossible — a habitable moon base would be vastly easier to engineer than a seafloor colony. See my answer to International Space Station: Given the actual space station ISS, would it be cheaper to build the equivalent at 3-4-5 miles deep underwater? Why?To recap: **we don’t spend more time/money exploring the ocean because it’s expensive, difficult, and uninspiring.** We stare up at the stars and dream of reaching them, but few people look off the side of a boat and wish they could go down there.

### 2nc Link --- Linear

#### We win even if we lose uniqueness --- every dollar spent has a negative economic impact

Furth 6/9, Salim Furth, PhD, is Senior Policy Analyst in Macroeconomics in the Center for Data Analysis, of the Institute for Economic Freedom and Opportunity, at The Heritage Foundation, Stimulus or Austerity? Fiscal Policy in the Great Recession and European Debt Crisis, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2014/06/stimulus-or-austerity-fiscal-policy-in-the-great-recession-and-european-debt-crisis

Protecting economic growth is not the only economic purpose of government. There are trade-offs. But growth remains vital to creating individual opportunities, and the private-sector economy is the source of funding for the rest of government’s priorities.

U.S. policymakers should address the coming public-funding crisis with the best economic research in mind: Tax increases will slow growth at more than a dollar-for-dollar rate; spending cuts will likely have little effect on growth. The recent history of stimulus and austerity corroborates the scholarly research and confirms that it is never too early to prepare America’s finances for the next recession.

### 2nc Link --- Linear/China War

#### Each dollar risks economic collapse and China war

Rumbelow 11 (Helen, staff writer, the Australian, http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/world/pentagon-prepares-for-economic-warfare/story-e6frg6so-1226118380617)

Yet this was no traditional battle game, but rather the Pentagon's first economic war game, and the authorities are loath to talk about it. Economic war? It sounds preposterous. Except it gets less so with every dollar of debt run up by the US. Behind the scenes, the military are worried about the market. For who owns much of this debt? China, the US's most powerful rival and threat. And that makes America vulnerable to a new kind of bloodless but ruthless war. Rickards is not a soldier but a banker. He was joined in the war game by dozens of his Wall Street colleagues, flown in from Manhattan to this bunker at the Applied Physics Laboratory in Maryland for the two-day event in 2009, when the Pentagon started to get really alarmed. The group was split into five teams: America, Russia, China, Pacific Rim, and a "grey team", representing shady outfits such as terrorist organisations. They were sent into "bunker rooms" and told to use financial or economic tools - currency, debt, stocks, gold - to bring their enemies to their knees. Everything was conducted via computer, and they could be as devious and ruthless as they liked. The bankers liked. "These people would normally never come together. But there is nothing more fun than to take a Wall Street guy and tell him to be a bad guy," says Mr Rickards, a former senior executive who was involved in planning and executing the war game. When the game was halted, the result left the military men quiet and sobered. Why did the bankers scare the soldiers? The answer lies in the way the world is now interconnected as never before. Over the past few years, China has been buying up US government debt and is now its biggest holder. If China were to dump this debt, it would totally screw with the economy. China could, hypothetically, win any number of foreign policy objectives by making it impossible for you to pay your mortgage. Paul Bracken is a professor and expert in private equity at the Yale School of Management who serves on government advisory committees at the US Department of Defence. He was one of the key players behind the 2009 economic war game, and the smaller versions that have been played out since. "The atmosphere that day was one of surprise at the magnitude of the threat," he says. "The Pentagon people were used to dealing in terms of military battles: how many ships, how many missiles. This opened up whole new strategies." Of course, economic warfare is not new. God's plagues on the Egyptian pharaoh's crops, as reported in the Book of Exodus, were an early skirmish. Winston Churchill created a Ministry of Economic Warfare, to run as a "new instrument of war" against Hitler. Embargoes and sanctions have been targeted at dozens of countries, from South Africa to the former Soviet Union. But this is different. The markets are now global, the holdings in each other's finances deep, and the technical ability to manipulate them instantaneous. In the 1970s the West feared that its enemies had their fingers on a nuclear button. The modern equivalent may be China's ability to press the button on US Treasury bills. China is, Professor Bracken says, "the huge threat", but Russia, with its oil and gas, has shown no compunction in waging economic war on its neighbours, and could do so on a larger scale. Another possibility is that major oil-producing countries could destabilise America by switching to euros instead of dollars as the currency in which oil is priced - so-called "petro-dollar warfare". Or a terrorist organisation might trigger a financial crash via some kind of shady hedge fund or computer attack. What the economic war game showed Professor Bracken was that military and economic decision-making has to be more unified. Banks and bonds are now weapons, just as much as bombs. "That makes the military nervous, as they had always been in charge of operations. That's why they know they need to understand this," Professor Bracken says. Mr Rickards says that, "If you're going to confront the US military, you would spend billions.But if you can do so just as effectively in financial space, and it would cost less, why not?" Perhaps Britain felt a taste of this last year, with some stockmarket shocks that wiped millions off three British companies. BT lost pound stg. 969 million ($1.5 billion) on one afternoon in August, Next lost pound stg. 275m. Security services had to probe the possibility that it was not technical faults, as initially supposed, but a concerted attack by a nation state. John Bassett, a fellow of the Royal United Services Institute, says the British government is just waking up to the new order. "If those were deliberate attacks on the London stockmarket, it was highly unlikely to be a criminal gang, much more likely an economic rival," he says. "This is a ruthless competition for global economic supremacy, and the West isn't winning."

### 2nc --- Cost Overruns

#### Don’t believe their low cost estimates --- ocean projects cause massive cost-overruns which independently tank solvency

Miller 13, Paul Miller writes at Cloud of Data, Based in the UK and working globally, Cloud of Data's consultancy services help clients understand the implications of taking data and more to the Cloud, Cloud on merit, not by dictat, http://cloudofdata.com/2013/05/cloud-on-merit-not-by-dictat/

Technological advances and shifting business requirements affect Government just as much as they do the enterprise. Fragmentation and siloisation can be used to explain sprawling data centre estates, which officials now work hard to consolidate. Shifting requirements, over-engineering, cronyism and politics can all take the blame for massive cost-overruns on boil the ocean projects that rarely realise their promise. Lighter, nimbler, more responsive, more accountable and more cost-effective approaches to Government IT are undeniably required, and it’s true that cloud can — and should — play a role here.

### ---NOAA Cost Overruns

#### NOAA’s especially prone to cost overruns --- no accountability

Joint Ocean Committee 6, APPROPRIATIONS: Senate panel boosts ocean, fisheries research at NOAA, http://www.jointoceancommission.org/news-room/in-the-news/2006-07-14\_Senate\_panel\_boosts\_ocean\_&\_fisheries\_research\_at\_NOAA@E&E\_Daily.pdf

"If not for DOD, this committee wonders at what point NOAA would have acted on its own to report the cost overruns and conduct its own recertification," the CJS committee report reads, echoing similar harsh report language approved by House appropriators (E&E Daily, June 21). The Senate report goes on to cite "NOAA's history of passive oversight" as justification for the spending cuts, noting that the Senate will withhold $100 million in NPOESS funds from NOAA until the agency contracts a "nonprofit research organization," presumably the National Academy of Sciences, to conduct a cost and operational effectiveness analysis of NPOESS.

#### There’s terrible oversight

Cantwell 10, Senator from Washington, Cantwell: Top-to-Bottom Mismanagement of NOAA Home Porting Decision, Millions of Taxpayer Dollars Could be Wasted, http://www.cantwell.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2010/6/post-38ade549-e8c2-4dc8-86ca-b0d80faf58e4

The IG report found flaws in the way NOAA handled the competition for the home port site selection, though it said elimination of those flaws would not have changed the outcome. The most serious problems, according to the IG, occurred before the beginning of the competition.

“In our view, the more fundamental problems pertain to NOAA’s process prior to the competitive lease process,” the IG wrote in the letter. “A primary cause of these problems is grounded in the fact that NOAA did not subject the MOC-P project to a rigorous capital investment planning and oversight process….While the Department has a clear real property policy, NOAA did not follow it. NOAA thus proceeded with requirements for its desired option of a consolidated MOC-P facility and an operating lease, based on justification and consideration of alternatives that on their face and without additional documentation were significantly lacking.”

### 2nc --- Fund Siphoning --- NOAA

#### NOAA siphons funds from the plan to other projects – means they link but the aff never gets implemented – vote neg on presumption

Cuddy 12, Don Cuddy writes at South Coast Today, NOAA comes under criticism again, this time over National Weather Service funding, http://www.southcoasttoday.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20120605/NEWS/206050318/1018/OPINION

An internal investigation has uncovered ongoing financial irregularities at the weather service, according to a NOAA memo. In fiscal 2012 alone, up to $35 million may have been "reprogrammed," the term employed by NOAA to describe what has taken place, the memo said.

"This is a case of robbing Peter to pay Paul," said Jeff Ruch, executive director of PEER, a national organization of federal, state and local employees who work in the environmental field. Structural deficits were built into the National Weather Service budget according to Ruch. "They were using appropriated funds to backfill general operations in a sort of budgetary Ponzi scheme," he said.

A 60-page report produced by NOAA found that, for at least the past two years, the agency has been shifting appropriated funds from a number of its designated programs and using them to cover other expenses and to help avoid employee furloughs, according to Ruch.

**More evidence – the problem is endemic to NOAA**

**Conathan 13 –** Michael Conathan is the Director for Ocean Policy at the Center for American Progress (“Fish on Fridays: The Dollars and Science of Fishery Management” http://americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2013/03/29/58228/the-dollars-and-science-of-fishery-management/)

**Rep. John Fleming** (R-LA) was particularly vociferous in taking the former side. He **charged NOAA with using its funding “inefficiently” to research climate change and**[**at one point pontificated**](http://naturalresources.house.gov/calendar/eventsingle.aspx?EventID=322259)**that the cost of one “climate satellite” was $750 million**. Presumably, he was referring to NOAA’s environmental-monitoring satellites that—in addition to collecting climate data—also happen to be fundamental weather-forecasting tools. Without them, hurricane tracking, for example, could lose as much as [50 percent](http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2011/03/24/207753/noaa-satellite-funding-forecasts/) of its accuracy—a degradation with which Rep. Fleming’s downstate neighbors might have more than a passing concern.

Perhaps the broader point that Rep. Fleming missed in pointing his finger at the agency is that Congress prohibits NOAA from dipping into its satellite funding to cover the cost of fisheries research. That’s called “misuse of funds,” and Congress gets very angry when agencies tamper with its carefully crafted spending plans. **In fact, NOAA found itself in**[**hot water**](http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2012-06-20/politics/35459927_1_national-weather-service-noaa-atmospheric-administration)**last year when Congress found that the agency “reprogrammed” $36 million from one National Weather Service account to pay employees in another part of the Weather Service.** So shifting funding from the satellite program to the fisheries account seems as if it would be a shady solution at best.

### 2nc --- Party Boats! --- NOAA

**NOAA is corrupt and wasteful—$300,000 splurge on a party boat.**

**Tilford 12** (The Examiner. Robert Tilford is a reporter for the Examiner. February 18, 2012. “NOAA officials used $300,000 luxury boat for alcohol-fueled parties.” <http://www.examiner.com/article/noaa-officials-used-300-000-luxury-boat-for-alcohol-fueled-parties>.)

WASHINGTON D.C. - **According to information in the Congressional Record** - **the** National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (**NOAA**) **purchased a luxury boat for $300,000 dollars, which it used for beer parties and BBQ’s.** This boat has a fully appointed bar, the latest onboard entertainment systems complete with leather furniture…According to the Inspector General, NOAA had no reasonable official use for this boat. Furthermore **NOAA officials in charge** were accused of ‘‘**manipulate**’’ and ‘‘violate’’ the **government purchasing rules to get this boat**, which they used for alcohol fueled parties with friends and family members. NOAA officials used the boat for the following: Trips to dockside restaurants; Hamburger and hotdog BBQs and alcohol-fueled parties and with family and friends; ‘‘Pleasure cruises’’ at high rates of speed, with beer consumed on board; Even though Federal rules ban non-employees from being on vessels, a NOAA supervisor even told a subordinate that his (young beautiful) wife was welcome to ‘‘kick back and watch TV’’ on the boat. Then they filed expense reports and reimbursed themselves for these trips and parties where alcohol was present. A booze cruise is a booze cruise. One NOAA officer decided to take his entire family on a weekend trip to a posh resort. He took the NOAA party boat to get there…this official then blew a $30,000 dollar engine in the process. The $300,000 party boat purchases, $12,000 in party boat expenses paid with fishermen’s fines, a $30,000 engine destroyed by a NOAA employee on his weekend vacation… **One** Congressional **official said NOAA has a “culture of corruption**”…and urged the President of the United States to fire NOAA Administrator Jane Lubchenco over this luxury debacle. “Other interesting facts came out in the information contained in the Congressional Record, for 2-17, 2-2012. It turns out that **NOAA already has many boats and more cars than it has agents**”, said Whitey Burns of Charlotte, of Congressional Watch dog organization “Spot Watch”.

### 2nc --- Investors Perceive Small Changes

#### Investors are a sensitive bunch and perceive small changes

DW 2/7, Deutsche Well is a German Newspaper, http://www.dw.de/us-debt-ceiling-reloaded/a-17416871

But bondholders and other investors are a sensitive bunch, and if confidence in the world's biggest economy suffers, it can cause them to hold fewer US Treasuries or [US dollars](http://www.dw.de/us-dollars-exorbitant-privilege-at-risk/a-17156068).

"This is the biggest impact of all this," Kirkegaard told DW. "An increase in uncertainty, less investment, fewer jobs created and lower growth."

"Brinkmanship over the debt ceiling casts uncertainty over the full faith and credit of the US and risks undermining confidence in the role of the US dollar and having a detrimental effect on the economy," Ed Parker, a managing director at Fitch Ratings told DW via e-mail.

### 2nc --- AT: Cost Estimates

#### Don’t trust their cost estimates --- the government lies and it always costs more

Edwards 11 Chris Edwards is the director of tax studies at CATO, Infrastructure Projects to fix the Economy? Don’t Bank on it, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/infrastructure-projects-fix-economy-dont-bank-it

Looking at the Corps and Reclamation, the first lesson about federal infrastructure projects is that you can't trust the cost-benefit analyses. Both agencies have a history of fudging their studies to make proposed projects look better, understating the costs and overstating the benefits. And we've known it, too. In the 1950s, Sen. Paul Douglas (D-Ill.), lambasted the distorted analyses of the Corps and Reclamation. According to Reisner, Reclamation's chief analyst admitted that in the 1960s he had to "jerk around" the numbers to make one major project look sound and that others were "pure trash" from an economics perspective. In the 1970s, Jimmy Carter ripped into the "computational manipulation" of the Corps. And in 2006, the Government Accountability Office found that the Corps' analyses were "fraught with errors, mistakes, and miscalculations, and used invalid assumptions and outdated data." Even if federal agencies calculate the numbers properly, members of Congress often push ahead with "trash" projects anyway. Then-senator Christopher Bond of Missouri vowed to make sure that the Corps' projects in his state were funded, no matter what the economic studies concluded, according to extensive Washington Post reporting on the Corps in 2000. And the onetime head of the Senate committee overseeing the Corps, George Voinovich of Ohio, blurted out at a hearing: "We don't care what the Corps cost-benefit is. We're going to build it anyhow because Congress says it's going to be built."

## Internal Link

### 2nc AT: No Downgrade --- Risk Hurts Economy

#### Just the risk of downgrade triggers our markets internal link

Washington Post 10/15, 2013, http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/as-us-faces-potential-downgrade-markets-flash-alarm-over-debt-ceiling-impasse/2013/10/15/0321fed6-35be-11e3-80c6-7e6dd8d22d8f\_story.html

“The Fitch action is another chink in the armor as the full faith and credit of the United States is called into question,” said Scott Anderson, chief economist at the Bank of the West in San Francisco. “Markets are starting to get frustrated that we haven’t seen more movement, and they’re starting to worry.”

#### **More ev**

CNBC 10/15, Fitch puts US AAA rating on rating watch negative, http://www.cnbc.com/id/101093033#.

Fitch Ratings put the US government's "AAA" credit rating on 'rating watch negative' Tuesday, saying that the standstill on the U.S. debt ceiling negotiations risks undermining the effectiveness of the country's government and political institutions.

U.S. stock index futures fell.

"Although Fitch continues to believe that the debt ceiling will be raised soon, the political brinkmanship and reduced financing flexibility could increase the risk of a U.S. default," the rating agency wrote in a statement.

S&P 500 futures fell 9.6 points while Dow Jones industrial average futures sank 60 points and Nasdaq 100 futures fell 7.5 points.

### 2nc Econ Internal --- Downgrade Goes Global

#### Downgrade causes global economic collapse

Gilani 11 (Shah, Contributing Editor Money Morning, “The Debt-Ceiling-Debacle: The Surprising Way a Default or Downgrade Could Crush the Global Economy, 7-29-11, http://moneymorning.com/2011/07/29/debt-ceiling-debacle-surprising-way-a-default-or-downgrade-could-crush-global-economy/, twm)

If there's a "worst-case scenario" for this whole debt-ceiling debacle, this is it. After studying everything that could happen due to a downgrade of the United States' top-tier AAA credit rating, and the potential default on its debt, we found a scenario that would result in forced asset sales that are so widespread that global stock-and-bond markets would plunge - and economies around the world would crash. Tangible evidence that this frightening scenario could really play out surfaced on Monday, when the Chicago Mercantile Exchange (CME) announced it was increasing the "haircut" that it applies to U.S. government debt posted as collateral by traders transacting on the exchange. The retail investors who didn't just ignore this announcement altogether probably dismissed it as a boring bit of administrative housekeeping by the CME. In truth, however, this kind of re-evaluation of U.S. Treasury securities, widely used as loan collateral, could trigger global margin calls and widespread asset sales. If that occurs, it's only a matter of time before the ripple effects of escalating margin calls could weigh down asset prices around the world.

### 2nc AT: Downgrade Empirically Denied

#### The second downgrade’s worse:

#### Collapses business confidence --- causes full-blown double-dip recession

**Gabriel 11** Michael Gabriel, writer for Vitaver and Associates, Inc., 8/1/11, “How the Recent U.S. Credit Downgrade Can Affect Job Hiring,” Vitaver and Associates, Inc., http://www.vitaver.com/blog/2011/08/recent-us-credit-downgrade-affect-jobs/

Just like that, the United States’ credit rating has dropped from AAA to AA+, according to Standard and Poor’s. Though AA+ isn’t bad at all, since it means that the country still has a strong capability to meet its financial obligations, nothing still beats triple A, and a downgrade isn’t really something you’d expect from a superpower such as America. Needless to say, a downgrade can be a prelude to a more negative economic outlook, worse a double-dip recession. This may also mean that other credit rating agencies such as Fitch Group and Moody’s may follow suit, further propelling the country down. Since all factors in economics are interdependent, you can surely expect some changes in the way businesses work and hire workers. Though a lot of reports suggest that thousands of people have been actually hired and that there’s a reduction in unemployment claims, many things could happen between today and tomorrow. These include the following scenarios: 1. Companies may freeze hiring. They may try to implement the “wait and see” attitude. Although many organizations won’t terminate thier employees, they may stop getting new hires until they can surely feel that the economy starts to pick up. 2. Businesses may become choosy. Firms across the US will try their best to reduce their overhead expenditures as much as possible. One of the possible steps they might take is to avoid hiring fresh graduates or those who lack experience. Training can cost a lot of money for companies, especially for start-ups. 3. Enterprises may decide to look for workers elsewhere. To be more specific, they may opt to outsource a lot of jobs to telecommute or home-based workers (both local and international). This can be both a good and a bad thing for you. It’s ideal since you’ll have more time at home. You can make the most out of your utilities, such as your phone and Internet connection, as well as spend less on outdoor expenses. However, home-based jobs may also make things unstable. Unless you have a contract from the company, the business owner has the prerogative to kick you out or lay you off even without the typical 30 days’ notice. 4. Organizations may lay off employees. This is something that should be avoided. Businesses should continue to operate in order to keep the economy going. However, if things take a much worst turn, such as getting more downgrades from other agencies, companies may simply decide to lay off employees while it’s still early. It also doesn’t help that Europe, one of America’s biggest markets for exports and imports, is also experiencing its own economic troubles. 5. Companies may do nothing at all. A common effect of a downgrade is an increase in interest rates. This way, the government can gather more money to pay off debts. Fortunately, the Federal Reserves has already announced that it’s going to keep interest rates low for the next two years. If businesses are happy with that, or if they believe they have good leaders and committed government agencies, they may just continue on with their normal operations, with hardly any changes.

#### Causes capital flight and tanks consumer confidence

Dorning Detrixhe and Katz 12, Mike Dorning, John Detrixhe and Ian Katz, Bloomberg Press, 07/16/’12, [Downgrade Anniversary Shows Investors Gained Buying U.S., <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-07-16/downgrade-anniversary-shows-investors-gained-buying-u-s-.html>] VN\

Still, the possibility of another downgrade will weigh on policy makers, said William Daley, Obama’s former White House chief of staff. Even though Treasury yields fell, “consumer confidence dropped dramatically after the downgrade, and do we really want to test that again?” he said. The Conference Board’s Consumer Confidence index plunged from 59.2 in July 2011 to 45.2 in August in the wake of the debt standoff and credit downgrade. The index didn’t recover to its July level until December. Growth in consumer spending slowed from 0.8 percent in July of last year to 0.1 percent in August before rebounding to 0.7 percent in September. Investors in America Romney, speaking to reporters in Concord, New Hampshire, three days after the downgrade, said the ratings cut “has a consequence not only for our borrowing cost long-term, but also for the ability of America to have the confidence of people around the world as investors in America.” Glenn Hubbard, a Romney economic adviser, said in a July 12 telephone interview that the Republican candidate “was and is absolutely right.” Flight of capital out of Europe, a slowing world economy and the Fed’s program of replacing holdings of short-term debt with longer-term securities have obscured the impact of the downgrade, he said. Ryan, a Wisconsin Republican, also defended his warning, saying interest rates haven’t gone up only because so many other nations are in such bad shape. Save Haven “We are a safe haven for now” for investors because of Europe’s debt crisis, Ryan said in an interview. Rates will rise, he predicted. “We just don’t know when, and I don’t want to tempt fate.”

## Impact

### 2nc Impact --- Debt --- China Collapse

#### Declining confidence in the dollar collapses China’s economy

Foster 9 (J.D., Foster received his doctorate in economics from Georgetown University, his master's degree in economics from Brown University, and bachelor's degrees in economics and mathematics from the University of Colorado. “Will China Keep Buying Our Debt?”, http://www.heritage.org/about/staff/f/j-d--foster//HH)

Some suspect the Chinese are building financial leverage - that is, building a "club" to coerce the US government to yield to their demands on other fronts, lest they dump their dollar reserves on the world market and tank the US dollar and possibly economy. But there's a big hole in this idea. Remember the old joke: When you owe the bank $1 million, the bank tells you what to do - but when you owe the bank a $100 million, you can tell the bank what to do. In other words, China can't dump its reserves without taking huge losses - and tanking its own export-driven economy. The Chinese have accumulated reserves as they prevent their currency, the renminbi, from appreciating. They sell their currency and buy dollars in world markets to offset market pressures that would otherwise force the renminbi up and the dollar down. But why are the Chinese manipulating the value of their currency? It may be, as Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner briefly suggested, to protect their competitiveness in global markets, or they might be trying to protect their domestic financial system. Whatever China's reasons for its past policies, it's now, like everybody else, in economic trouble. (Memo to President Hu Jintao: An export platform is especially vulnerable to a world-trade collapse.) The Beijing central planners face a real conundrum. To sustain their economy and avoid a political upheaval, they need to keep on exporting more than they import. With exports plunging, this means they must clamp down on imports. It also means acquiring more international reserves (and buying US Treasury bonds). But they may also need to use their existing reserves to prop up their own economy and possibly to recapitalize their banks much as we are doing. Yet doing so would mean selling US Treasuries and triggering the soaring renminbi and declining exports they tried to avoid in the first place.. And as they consider their options, party leaders watch us closely. They see a US government borrowing trillions a year in a forlorn attempt to spend its way out of the unfolding recession. They know that US government borrowing will drive up US interest rates, relieving some of the upward pressure on the renminbi. But those higher interest rates also mean a longer recession, a weaker recovery and fewer imports from China. And all this government borrowing is threatening the US credit rating. The Chinese must soon wonder if the United States is such a safe place to invest after all. Add in the fact that it's faced its own troubles at home, and Beijing may lose its appetite for US Treasuries. What happens then? If China simply starts buying more of other countries' debt, and less of ours, it will put a little upward pressure on US interest rates. But if it stops buying Treasuries, then the dollar would slide and US interest rates would jump. And if Beijing stopped buying any foreign debt, its exports would plunge further and unemployment would skyrocket. Economic and political implosion of China itself would be near-certain. Bottom line: This is an inherently unstable situation, fraught with peril for both countries. We'd all be best off if Beijing were to gradually reduce its purchases of US securities - producing an orderly rebalancing of global trade and capital flows as China became less export-dependent and the US less dependent on China's ATM (and exchange rates trended toward market-based levels). This is how countries fix economic problems before they create a global meltdown.

#### Extinction

Plate 3 [Tom, Professor at UCLA, The Straights Times, “Neo-cons a bigger risk to Bush than China,” 6-28-2003]

But imagine a China disintegrating- on its own, without neo-conservative or Central Intelligence Agency prompting, much less outright military invasion because the economy (against all predictions) suddenly collapses. That would knock Asia into chaos. A massive flood of refugees would head for Indonesia and other places with poor border controls, which don’t’ want them and can’t handle them; some in Japan might lick their lips at the prospect of World War II revisited and look to annex a slice of China. That would send Singapore and Malaysia- once occupied by Japan- into nervous breakdowns. Meanwhile, India might make a grab for Tibet, and Pakistan for Kashmir. Then you can say hello to World War III, Asia style. That’s why wise policy encourages Chinese stability, security and economic growth – the very direction the White House now seems to prefer.

### 2nc Impact --- Downgrade --- Food

#### Loss of confidence in the dollar causes global instability and skyrocketing food prices

Min 10 **–** (David, Associate Director for Financial Markets Policy – Center for American Progress, “The Big Freeze”, 10-28, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/10/big\_freeze.html)

The U.S. dollar, of course, is the world’s reserve currency in large part because of the depth and liquidity of the U.S. Treasury bond market. If this market is severely disrupted, and investors lost confidence in U.S. Treasurys, then it is unclear where nervous investors might go next. A sharp and swift move by investors out of U.S. Treasury bonds could be highly destabilizing, straining the already delicate global economy.

Imagine, for example, if investors moved from sovereign debt into commodities, most of which are priced and traded in dollars. This could have the catastrophic impact of weakening the world’s largest economies while also raising the prices of the basic inputs (such as metals or food) that are necessary for economic growth.

In short, a freeze on the debt ceiling would cause our interest payments to spike, making our budget situation even more problematic, while potentially triggering greater global instability—perhaps even a global economic depression.

#### **That causes billions of deaths and global instability**

Brown 7 **–** (Lester R., Director – Earth Policy Institute, 3-21, http://www.earth-policy.org/Updates/2007/Update65.htm)

Urban food protests in response to rising food prices in low and middle income countries, such as Mexico, could lead to political instability that would add to the growing list of failed and failing states. At some point, spreading political instability could disrupt global economic progress. Against this backdrop, Washington is consumed with “ethanol euphoria.” President Bush in his State of the Union address set a production goal for 2017 of 35 billion gallons of alternative fuels, including grain-based and cellulosic ethanol, and liquefied coal. Given the current difficulties in producing cellulosic ethanol at a competitive cost and given the mounting public opposition to liquefied coal, which is far more carbon-intensive than gasoline, most of the fuel to meet this goal might well have to come from grain. This could take most of the U.S. grain harvest, leaving little grain to meet U.S. needs, much less those of the hundred or so countries that import grain. The stage is now set for direct competition for grain between the 800 million people who own automobiles, and the world’s 2 billion poorest people. The risk is that millions of those on the lower rungs of the global economic ladder will start falling off as higher food prices drop their consumption below the survival level.

### **---XT: Food Impact**

#### This is the greatest impact --- 3 billion are at risk

**Brown 5** (Lester, President – Earth Policy Institute, , People and the Planet, “Falling Water Tables 'Could Hit Food Supply'”, 2-7, http://www.peopleandplanet.net/doc.php?id=2424)

Many Americans see terrorism as the principal threat to security, but for much of humanity, the effect of water shortages and rising temperatures on food security are far more important issues. For the 3 billion people who live on 2 dollars a day or less and who spend up to 70 per cent of their income on food, even a modest rise in food prices can quickly become life-threatening. For them, it is the next meal that is the overriding concern."

### 2nc Impact --- Downgrade/Dollar --- T/ Heg

#### Dollar’s the most important factor to heg

Taylor 5 (Jay, Editor – Gold & Technology Stocks, Gold Digest, 1-21, http://www.gold-eagle.com/gold\_digest\_05/taylor012105.html)

Given my views that we are inevitably headed toward a deflationary cleansing of the excesses of the market, I have always had a sense that at some point the dollar would show surprising strength. But given the U.S. addiction to foreign capital, I have come more recently to believe that avoiding a major collapse of the U.S. dollar is a policy that must be maintained at virtually all costs. It is a well-documented fact that we Americans have enjoyed a consumption spree beyond belief because of low interest rates made possible by foreigners reinvesting their export earnings in the U.S. What fewer people have focused on, however, is the really big reason why the U.S. cannot afford to let the dollar fall too far, even if defending it means a collapse of the U.S. housing and equity market and an evolution into the Kondratieff winter depression. The survival of an American empire that can send its military into foreign lands to secure sources of oil, secure trade routes, and intimidate foreign leaders into "playing ball" requires that the dollar remain the world's reserve currency. Nothing is more important to the survival of U.S. superpower status than the dollar remaining as the world’s reserve currency.

# Affirmative

### Offshore Wind --- AT: Spending Link

#### A hybrid system of tariffs and contracts will reduce the risk for investors and cut the cost of investment

Green & Vasilakos 10 – Richard Green and Nicholas Vasilakos are professors in the Department of Economics at the University of Birmingham (“The Economics of Offshore Wind” http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421510007615)

Hybrid schemes are also possible. In Spain, the system of support for most renewable generators has moved from a pure feed-in tariff to a fixed premium on top of the market price, to a premium that is adjusted to keep the generator’s overall revenue within a particular range ([Klessmann et al., 2008](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421510007615" \l "bib17)). While the pure feed-in tariff remained available to the generators that had signed up to it, the premium was set at a level that made it most willing to change to it. The UK government has promised to keep the size of the Renewables Obligation at a fixed percentage above the expected level of generation. This should have the effect, as with a feed-in tariff, of providing the same level of support to any volume of generation (until the policy is changed).[9](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421510007615#fn9) The (previous) government had also suggested that it should offer fixed price contracts (or contracts for differences) to hedge renewable generators’ revenues from selling energy, thus further reducing the variation in their revenues.[10](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421510007615#fn10)The advantage of these hybrid schemes is that they reduce the generators’ revenue risks, compared to a pure certificate scheme, while still providing some more market exposure than the pure feed-in tariff. If lower risks lead to a lower cost of capital, this will be particularly useful for wind farms, since the cost of construction is such a high proportion of the station’s lifetime costs. The [European Commission (2008)](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421510007615#bib8), drawing on the work by [Ragwitz et al. (2007)](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421510007615" \l "bib26), has assessed the effectiveness (in promoting increases in renewable generation) and efficiency (in terms of avoiding excessive generator profitability) of renewable support schemes across the EU, concluding that “well-adapted feed-in tariff regimes are generally the most efficient and effective support schemes for promoting renewable electricity” (page 3, italics in original).

#### Prices of offshore wind power expected to drop with higher production

**Ocean Energy Council 3-25** – a communicative and representative vehicle of the international ocean energy community (“Offshore Wind Energy” http://www.oceanenergycouncil.com/ocean-energy/offshore-wind-energy/)

The cost of electricity is a major factor in hydrogen production costs. Although any solar energy option can generate the electricity needed for hydrogen production, the cost of electricity generated from photovoltaic solar cells is approximately 10-times more expensive than the electricity generated from megawatt-scale wind machines. State-of-the-art wind systems, which have an installed capital cost of approximately $1,000 per kW and a 35% capacity factor, are able to generate electricity for approximately 4-cents per kWh. If the wind systems are mass-produced like automobiles for large-scale hydrogen production, their capital costs will be expected to drop to well below $300/kW, which will reduce the cost of electricity to 1 or 2-cents per kilowatt hour (kWh).There is some scope for reversing the whole way we look at power supply, in its 24-hour, 7-day cycle, using peak load equipment simply to meet the daily peaks.

### Remote Sensing --- AT: Spending Link

#### Remote sensing satellites are the most cost-effective way of mapping so far

**Mumby et al 98 –** this article was a collaboration between members of the Sheffield Centre for Earth Observation Science and Department of Geography at the University of Sheffield and the Centre for Tropical Coastal Management Studies at the University of Newcastle (“The cost-effectiveness of remote sensing for tropical coastal resources assessment management” http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301479798902559)

Although coastal habitat mapping is expensive, remote sensing is a more cost-effective technique than alternative field-survey methods (where effectiveness is defined as overall map accuracy). Satellite imagery is suitable for coarse detail habitat mapping where overall accuracies ofc. 70% can be achieved but is inadequate for fine detail mapping, achievingc. 40% accuracy. Four types of cost are encountered when undertaking remote sensing: (1) set-up costs, (2) field survey costs, (3) image acquisition costs and (4) the time spent on analysis of field data and processing imagery. The largest of these are set-up costs such as the acquisition of hardware and software which may comprise 48–78% of the total cost of the project depending on specific objectives. For coarse-detail habitat mapping with satellite imagery, the second highest cost is field survey which can account forc. 20% of total costs and >80% of total costs if a remote sensing facility already exists. Field survey is a vital component of any habitat mapping programme and may constitutec. 70% of project duration. For mapping small coastal areas (<60 km in any direction) in coarse detail, SPOT XS is the most cost-effective satellite sensor, but for larger areas Landsat TM is the most cost-effective and accurate sensor. Detailed habitat mapping should be undertaken using digital airborne scanners or interpretation of colour aerial photography (API). The cost of commissioning the acquisition of such imagery can be high [15 000–27 000 (US$24 000–$43 000) even for small areas of 150 km2] and may constitute 27–40% of total costs (64–75% if set-up costs are excluded). Acquisition of digital airborne imagery is more expensive than the acquisition of colour aerial photography but is offset against the huge investment in time required to create maps from API**.** If habitat maps are needed urgently, API may be prohibitively time-consuming. For small areas of say 150 km2, a map could be created within 25 days using CASI but might take six times longer to create using API. We estimate that API is only cheaper if the staff costs for API are considerably less than 80 days. As the scope of the survey increases in size, the cost of API is likely to rise much faster than that arising from digital airborne scanners. If the costs of API and digital airborne scanners are similar, the latter instruments should be favoured because they are likely to yield more accurate results than API.

#### Remote sensors are less expensive than alternatives

**Chewings et al 94 –** the authors have worked with remote sensors:Chewings has various publications on topology; Pickup is working in environmental science and has various publications on topology, particularly under the effects of water; Bastin is an ecologist (“Remote-Sensing-Based Condition Assessment for Nonequilibrium Rangelands Under Large-Scale Commercial Grazing” http://www.jstor.org/stable/view/1941952)

They also have some ability to detect systematic differences in forage quality with distancefrom water. Remote-sensing-based range assessment offers significant cost advantages. As part of the 50 000-km2 survey mentioned above, cost comparisons were made with the more conventional field-based techniques that rely on botanical data. If an area of the same size is examined using the procedures of the Centralian Range Assessment Program (Bastin 1989), the setup cost is - US$52 000, and 126 man-weeks of labor are required to measure all sites three times in 10 yr. By comparison, a remote-sensing-based assessment over the same pe- riod using the WPAC method has a setup cost of US$5 5 000 including computer hardware and software but requires only 47 man-weeks of labor (Bastin et al., in press). The cost saving is substantial, and the WPAC is now likely to be adopted as a standard technique by at least one government agency. An added advantage is that surveys can be done from archived satellite data, while field-based methods must accumulate data over long periods if range trend is to be investigated. Perhaps the most important element of the grazing gradient methods described here is their ability to be used on a very large scale.

### Non-Unique --- Entitlements

#### Entitlements doom fiscal discipline

Columbus Dispatch 6/25, No dodging fiscal reality Without reform, entitlements soon will gobble up federal budget, http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/editorials/2014/06/25/no-dodging-fiscal-reality.html

Last week, Portman recited the alarming facts that are well known to anyone familiar with the issue: Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid and other nondiscretionary spending programs make up two-thirds of the federal budget, and that will climb to three-fourths within 10 years. Without any changes, entitlement spending will double within 10 years, to the point that it consumes 100 percent of the nation’s tax revenues. That means that every other, discretionary federal program, from defense to highways to education, will have to be paid for by borrowing.

Clearly, entitlement spending has to change if the nation is to escape the consequences of ruinous debt. Portman put it well: “I don’t think it’s a matter of ideology or point of view. I think it is a matter of arithmetic. The numbers are simply overwhelming.”

### No Downgrade --- Moody’s

#### Moody’s will not downgrade us

Salmon 11 Reuters.“The difference between S&P and Moody’s.” AUGUST 9, 2011. Felix Salmon is a finance journalist for Reuters. http://blogs.reuters.com/felix-salmon/2011/08/09/the-difference-between-sp-and-moodys/

SOVEREIGN DEBT Amidst all the downgrade talk, one crucial point has been largely missing: there’s a very good reason why it was S&P, and not Moody’s, which downgraded the US. It’s this: the two companies don’t measure the same thing with their credit ratings. An S&P ratings seeks to measure only the probability of default. Nothing else matters — not the time that the issuer is likely to remain in default, not the expected way in which the default will be resolved. Most importantly, S&P simply doesn’t care what the recovery value is — the amount of money that investors end up with after the issuer has defaulted. Moody’s, by contrast, is interested not in default probability per se, but rather expected losses. Default probability is part of the total expected loss — but then you have to also take into account what’s likely to happen if and when a default occurs. The difference, as it applies to the US sovereign credit rating, is enormous. No one doubts America’s ability to pay its debts, and if the US should ever find itself in a position where it’s forced by law to default on a bond payment, that default is certain to be only temporary. Bondholders would get all of their money, in full, within a couple of weeks, and probably within a few days. Contrast that with, say, some incomprehensibly complex constant proportion debt obligation, which makes all of its payments by dint of clever leverage games, and which, if it ever does default, does so with utter finality, and will never pay out a single cent again.

### No Downgrade Impact

#### No impact to a downgrade--multiple internal links

Wiles 6/10 [Wiles, Russ. The Arizona Republic. Russ Wiles has been a personal-finance writer for The Arizona Republic for more than 20 years, covering investments, taxes, banking/credit, retirement planning, Arizona corporations and related topics. “Despite gains, U.S. misses top AAA credit rating again.” http://www.azcentral.com/story/money/business/2014/06/07/us-aaa-credit-rating-missed/10190239/]

Standard & Poor's made waves three years ago when it cut its rating on U.S. government debt from AAA. Usually, when a debt issuer gets downgraded, whether a government or corporation, that entity must pay a bit more in interest to attract investors because it is now perceived as more risky. So, too, for consumers who get downgraded in the form of a lower credit score. They pay higher borrowing costs on credit cards and mortgages, may face a higher deposit requirement for utility service or could see a rise in their auto-insurance rates. Yet the Standard & Poor's downgrade didn't have much tangible impact on either Washington's interest costs or its ability to issue more debt. After the downgrade, yields on government bills, notes and bonds actually fell. Investor demand remained robust. As noted, that's not supposed to happen. One reason it didn't is that the competition — namely, other big-nation governments — didn't look all that much more enticing, mired in debt problems of their own. Investors continued to look to the U.S. government as the ultimate safe haven during times of anxiety, and the economic turmoil of the past half-dozen years added a lot of uncertainty. It's worth noting that rival credit-rating agencies such as Moody's Investors Service and Fitch didn't follow with their own downgrades, turning the Standard & Poor's action into an isolated event. Fitch in late 2013 warned of a downgrade but canceled it this year. Moody's has stuck with a triple-A grade. In the greater scheme of things, a rating of AA+ isn't all that far removed from AAA, and Standard & Poor's continues to see a lot of positives for the country. It notes that the U.S. continues to have the largest and most diversified economy and a resilient one, all of which supports the government's ability to raise revenue. The U.S. also has impressive political and other instutitions and enjoys flexibility on matters of economic policy. It has a large, affluent population, the banking sector has recovered, and state and local governments are making progress. Standard & Poor's expects U.S. gross domestic product to expand by 2.5 to 3.5 percent annually over the next several years. "This growth rate is supported by a revival in manufacturing due to competitive labor costs and the lower cost of natural gas stemming from increased shale-gas production," the report said.

### No China Impact --- Alt Causes

#### Alt causes to Chinese collapse:

#### a) Housing

**Boesler 12** (Matthew, “BofA: A Hard Landing In China Could Soon Become A ‘High Probably Event,’” http://www.businessinsider.com/bofa-china-hard-landing-property-bubble-2012-7) KGH

**Recently, it appeared as though China's property bubble was unwinding as prices came down. Now, it looks like prices are turning up again.** These developments in the property market prompted Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao to comment over the weekend that "currently, **the property market adjustment is still at a crucial stage** and we must unswervingly continue the work and make the fight against speculative property investment demand a long-term policy." However, BofA China strategist David Cui thinks that based on remarks made by the People's Daily, a Chinese newspaper seen as the Communist Party's mouthpiece, **additional measures to curb the property market could come sooner than expected, which in turn could mean a hard landing for the Chinese economy.**

#### b) Collapsing demand

**Woo and Wagner 12** (Dee, economics lecturer at Beijing Royal School, Daniel, CEO of Country Risk Solutions, “China’s Coming Great Deleveraging,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dee-woo/china-economy-deleveraging\_b\_1674951.html) KGH

China's biggest problem is that **the state, SOEs and crony capitalists wield too much power over national economy,** have too much control over wealth creation and income distribution, and much of the GDP growth and vested interest groups' economic progress are made at the expense of average consumers who are stuck in a spiral of relative poverty. Faster GDP growth will in the end not mean much since Chinese consumers are unable to support the overcapacity in the housing market and lending markets. China will try to create more export momentum in an effort to sustain its growth, but this is a vicious circle of imbalance that even a revaluation of renminbi cannot break. Unsustainable **economic bubbles and collapsing demand are the root causes of China's slowing economy.** If these structural deficiencies are not properly addressed by the government, **things will get worse.** More frivolous rate cuts and other central banking maneuvering are sure to come, but to no avail, as the chain reaction will only be accelerated. **China will eventually face its end game - the dark side of a great deleveraging.**

### No China Impact --- Lash-out

**No lash-out**

**Gilley 4** [Bruce, former contributing editor at the Far Eastern Economic Review, M.A. Oxford, 2004, China’s Democratic Future, p. 114]

Yet the risks, even to a dying regime, may be too high. An unprovoked attack on Taiwan would almost certainly bring the U.S. and its allies to the island's rescue. Those forces would not stop at Taiwan but might march on Beijing and oust the CCP, or attempt to do so through stiff sanctions, calling it a threat to regional and world peace. Such an attack might also face the opposition of the peoples of Fujian, who would be expected to provide logis¬tical support and possibly bear the worst burdens of war. They, like much of coastal China, look to Taiwan for investment and culture and have a close affinity with the island. As a result, there are doubts about whether such a plan could be put into action. A failed war would prompt a Taiwan declaration of independence and a further backlash against the CCP at home, just as the May Fourth students of 1919 berated the Republican government for weakness in the face of foreign powers. Failed wars brought down authoritarian regimes in Greece and Portugal in 1974 and in Argentina in 1983. Even if CCP leaders wanted war, it is unlikely that the PLA would oblige. Top officers would see the disastrous implications of attacking Taiwan. Military caution would also guard against the even wilder scenario of the use of nuclear weapons against Japan or the U.S.47 At the height of the Tiananmen protests it appears there was consideration given to the use of nuclear weapons in case the battle to suppress the protestors drew in outside countries.48 But even then, the threats did not appear to gain even minimal support. In an atmosphere in which the military is thinking about its future, the resort to nuclear confrontation would not make sense.

### No Econ Impact

**Decline doesn’t cause war**

**Drezner 14**, Daniel W. Drezner is a professor of international politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, Global Economic Governance during the Great Recession, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world\_politics/v066/66.1.drezner.html

The final significant outcome addresses **a dog that hasn’t barked: the effect of the Great Recession on cross-border conflict and violence**. During the initial stages of the crisis, multiple **analysts asserted** that the **financial crisis would lead states to increase** their **use of force** as a tool for staying in power.42 They voiced genuine concern that the global economic downturn would lead to an increase in conflict—whether through greater internal repression, diversionary wars, arms races, or a ratcheting up of great power conflict. Violence in the Middle East, border disputes in the South China Sea, and even the disruptions of the Occupy movement fueled impressions of a surge in global public disorder.

The **aggregate data suggest otherwise**, however. The **Institute for Economics and Peace** has **concluded** that “the **average level of peacefulness in 2012 is approximately the same as it was in 2007**.”43 **Interstate violence** in particular has **declined since the start of the financial crisis, as have military expenditures in most** sampled **countries. Other studies confirm** that **the Great Recession has not triggered any increase in violent conflict**, as Lotta Themnér and Peter Wallensteen conclude: “[**T]he pattern is** one of **relative stability** when we consider the trend for the past five years.”44 The secular decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed. Rogers Brubaker observes that “**the crisis has not to date generated the surge in protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion that might have been expected**.”45 [End Page 134]

**The global economy is resilient**

**Drezner 14**, Daniel W. Drezner is a professor of international politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, Global Economic Governance during the Great Recession, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world\_politics/v066/66.1.drezner.html

**THE 2008 financial crisis posed the biggest challenge to the global economy since the Great Depression. During the first ten months of the “Great Recession,” global stock market capitalization plummeted lower as a percentage of its pre crisis level than during the first ten months of the 1930s** depression.1 Housing prices in the United States declined more than twice as much as they did during the Great Depression.2 Banks and other financial institutions lost more than $4 trillion in the value of their holdings as a result of the crisis.3 The global decline in asset values in 2008 was conservatively estimated to be $27 trillion, or roughly 50 percent of global economic output.4 Five years after the start of the subprime mortgage crisis, concerns about systemic risk were still elevated.

The demand for global economic governance structures to perform effectively is at its greatest during crises. I define global economic governance as a set of formal and informal rules that regulate the global economy and the collection of authority relationships that promulgate, coordinate, monitor, or enforce said rules. As Menzie Chinn and Jeffry Frieden note: “The 1929 recession became a depression largely [End Page 123] because of the collapse of international cooperation; the current crisis may head in that direction if international collaboration fails.”5 One of the primary purposes of global economic governance is to provide public goods—most importantly, keeping barriers to cross-border exchange low. An open global economy lessens the stagnation that comes from a financial crisis, preventing a downturn from metastasizing into a depression.6

Since the Great Recession began, **there has been no shortage of scorn for the state of global economic governance** in public perception, policy analysis, and scholarly assessment. Nevertheless, **a closer look** at the global response to the financial crisis **reveals a different picture. Despite initial shocks that were more severe than** the **1929** financial crisis, **global economic governance responded quickly and robustly**. Whether one looks at economic outcomes, policy outputs, or institutional resilience, these governance structures either reinforced or improved upon the status quo after the collapse of the subprime mortgage bubble. These **regimes performed particularly well during the acute phase of the crisis** in the fall of 2008, **ensuring** the **continuation of an open global economy.** To be sure, **there remain areas where global governance either faltered** or failed. Even **if the policy outcomes have been suboptimal, they have not been subpar. International institutions and frameworks performed contrary to expectations. Simply put, the system worked—the open global economy survived because of “good enough” global governance**.

If global economic governance has worked, why has there been such a widespread consensus that it has not? Misperceptions about global economic governance persist because the Great Recession has disproportionately affected the core economies, a fact that is also the center of gravity for commentary about the global political economy. Commentators based in the advanced industrialized states have conflated national governance with global governance. They have also overestimated the effectiveness of prior periods of global economic governance. Why **the system has worked better than expected** remains a more open question. We can tentatively conclude that both the power of the United States and the **resilience** of neoliberal economic ideas **were underestimated** during the depths of the Great Recession.

### No Food Impact

**High prices encourage better ag investment**

Kharas 8(Homi, sr. fellow @ the Brookings Institute, July 29, http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2008/0729\_food\_prices\_kharas.aspx)

The good news is that higher food prices are exactly what is required to restore balance in the market. With rising demand and constrained supply the iron law of economics permits no other response. In a market economy, when demand exceeds supply, prices rise. Higher prices discourage consumption, but they also encourage more investment and enhance production. Anyone who doubts the link between food prices and agricultural investment should take a close look at the stock price of the world’s largest producer of agricultural equipment, John Deere. While most US shares have taken a beating, John Deere’s share price has doubled and has split two-for-one in the last two years. High food prices are encouraging farmers to invest heavily in new equipment. This pattern is being repeated across the world, with investments in equipment, storage and land improvements.

**They are key to production and productivity**

Kharas 8(Homi, sr. fellow @ the Brookings Institute, July 29, http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2008/0729\_food\_prices\_kharas.aspx)

More food is already being produced in response to higher prices: forecasts for cereals production in 2008 by the Food and Agriculture Organisation show a significant increase. This should come as no surprise. When prices fell steeply between 1997 and 2002, cereal production declined. Now that prices have risen back to the levels of the mid-1990s, cereal production has resumed its upward trend. Productivity is on the rise.

### AT: NEPA

**Best studies prove NEPA doesn’t cause delays**

**Dreher 5** - Deputy Executive Director of the Georgetown Environmental Law & Policy Institute. He served as Deputy General Counsel of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Robert, “The Political Assault on the National Environmental Policy Act,” http://www.law.georgetown.edu/gelpi/research\_archive/nepa/NEPAUnderSiegeFinal.pdf

Finally, **the** evidence does not support the argument that the NEPA review process causes inordinate delays in decision-making. For example, **studies** by the Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”) **show that environmental reviews take up** only a quarter of the total time **devoted to planning and constructing a major highway project,** hardly a disproportionate commitment for projects that will make permanent changes to the landscape. 43 **The significant delays** that sometimes **occur in** highway **projects are generally due to other causes**, **such as** lack of funding, the low priority assigned to a project by the sponsoring state transportation agency, or significant **local disagreements** over the merits of the project. 44 **A** comprehensive survey conducted by the Natural Resources Council of America of agency NEPA implementation **confirmed that NEPA is not a major cause of project delays: In none of the twelve agencies reviewed during this study did NEPA emerge as the principal cause of excessive delays or costs**. Instead, the NEPA process was often viewed as the means by which a wide range of planning and review requirements were integrated. **Other administrative and Congressional requirements were sometimes cited as resulting in lengthy delays in decision making**, which persons outside the agencies attributed to NEPA. 45

**At worst, it’s a few months**

EIA 9 Environmental Impact Assessments, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/eia-studies-and-reports/eia-costs-benefit-en.htm

Preparation of the EIS typically takes 2-3 months. The subsequent stages of consultation, review and decision-making may take 3-6 months, depending upon the complexity of the issues raised.

# Negative – Coercion

### 1nc DA

#### Every instance of spending is immoral theft

Browne 95[Harry, Former Libertarian Party candidate for President and Director of Public Policy for the DownsizeDC.org, “Why Government Doesn't Work,” p.10-11]

The distinctive feature of the government is coercion – the use of force and the threat of force to win obedience. This is how government differs from every other agency in society. The others persuade; government compels. When someone demands that government help flood victims, he is saying he wants to force people to pay for flood relief. Otherwise, he’d be happy to have the Red Cross and its supporters handle everything. When someone wants government to limit the price of a product, he is asking to use force to prevent people from paying more for something they want. Otherwise, he would simply urge people not to patronize those he things are charging too much. When Congress passes a bill mandating “family leave,” it forces every employer to provide time off for family problems – even if its employees want the employer to use payroll money for some other benefit. Otherwise, employers and employees would be free to decide what works best in each situation. Nothing involving government is voluntary – as it would be when a private company does something. One way or another, there is compulsion in every government activity: - The government forces someone to pay for something; - The government forces someone to do something; or – The government forcibly prevents someone from doing something. There is no other reason to involve government.

#### Shatters value to life

Hayek 60 (F.A., Nobel Prize winner for Economics, The Constitution of Liberty, 1960, p.20, JMP)

By “coercion” we mean such control of the environment or circumstances of a person by another that, in order to avoid greater evil, he is forced to act not according to a coherent plan of his own but to serve the ends of another. Except in the sense of choosing the lesser evil in a situation forced on him by another, he is unable either to use his own intelligence or knowledge or to follow his own aims and beliefs. Coercion is evil precisely because it thus eliminates an individual as a thinking and valuing person and makes him a bare tool in the achievement of the ends of another. Free action, in which a person pursues his own aims by the means indicated by his own knowledge, must be based on data which cannot be shaped at will by another. It presupposes the existence of a known sphere in which the circumstances cannot be so shaped by another person as to leave one only that choice prescribed by the other.

### 2nc Impact --- Genocide

#### Coercion justifies genocidal atrocities

Browne 95(Harry, Former Libertarian Party candidate for President and Director of Public Policy for the DownsizeDC.org, Why Government Doesn’t Work, p.66-67)

The reformers of the Cambodian revolution claimed to be building a better world. They forced people into reeducation programs to make them better citizens. Then they used force to regulate every aspect of commercial life . Then they forced office workers and intellectuals to give up their jobs and harvest rice, to round out their education. When people resisted having their lives turned upside down, the reformers had to use more and more force. By the time they were done, they had killed a third of the country's population, destroyed the lives of almost everyone still alive, and devastated a nation. It all began with using force for the best of intentions-to create a better world. The Soviet leaders used coercion to provide economic security and to build a "New Man" - a human being who would put his fellow man ahead of himself. At least 10 million people died to help build the New Man and the Workers' Paradise. But human nature never changed-and the workers' lives were always Hell, not Paradise. In the 1930s many Germans gladly traded civil liberties for the economic revival and national pride Adolf Hitler promised them. But like every other grand dream to improve society by force, it ended in a nightmare of devastation and death. Professor R. J. Rummel has calculated that 119 million people have been killed by their own governments in this century. Were these people criminals? No, they were people who simply didn't fit into the New Order-people who preferred their own dreams to those of the reformers. Every time you allow government to use force to make society better, you move another step closer to the nightmares of Cambodia, the Soviet Union, and Nazi Germany. We've already moved so far that our own government can perform with impunity the outrages described in the preceding chapters. These examples aren't cases of government gone wrong; they are examples of government-period. They are what governments do-just as chasing cats is what dogs do. They are the natural consequence of letting government use force to bring about a drug-free nation, to tax someone else to better your life, to guarantee your economic security, to assure that no one can mistreat you or hurt your feelings, and to cover up the damage of all the failed government programs that came before.

### 2nc AT: Evaluate Consequence

#### Coercion can never be justified

Pilon 1 (Roger, Vice President for Legal Affairs and Director of the Center for Constitutional Studies at the Cato Institute, “Two Kinds of Rights,” 12-6-2001, www.cato.org/current/terrorism/pubs/pilon-011206.html, )

As the Declaration of Independence says, the main business of government is to secure rights, but legitimate government can't do it by any means. It can't violate rights in the name of securing them. That frames the issue. Between those boundaries—and given a world of uncertainty—the devil is in the details. Governments too restrained leave rights exposed. By contrast, societies that trade liberty for security, as Ben Franklin noted, end often with neither.

# Affirmative

### 2ac Ethics Turn

#### Tying wealth to rights is unethical

**Partridge 4** Ernest  Research Associate in Philosophy at the University of California, Riverside, and a lecturer-consultant in Applied Ethics and Environmental Ethics. *With Liberty for Some* Environmental Philosophy Prentice Hall, 2004).

The system sounds just fine for those with a super-abundance of wealth and power. But what of all the others in society? Not to worry, say the libertarians. Citing Adam Smith, the libertarian assures us that the enterprising entrepreneur who "intends only his own gain" will, in the course of maximizing his satisfactions, be "led by an invisible hand to promote... the public interest." (A. Smith, 423). "The invisible hand" metaphor has familiar variants, such as "the rising tide that lifts all boats" and "the trickle down effect". (As noted above, those who celebrate the "trickling down" of wealth from the most to the least advantaged, seem disinclined to notice that wealth also "percolates up" from the labor of the less advantaged, and from public adherence to a "well ordered" system of justice). By invoking, through "the invisible hand" and "the rising tide," the advantage to all which accrues from the self-motivated search for private wealth by each, **the libertarian** conveniently (if temporarily and inconsistently) **puts aside** his **"social atomism" in favor of an ad hoc theory of an integrated system of society.** In response to Milton Friedman's celebration of the "freedom to choose," one is immediately led to ask: "freedom of whom to 'choose' -- and at whose expense?" **Given the libertarian's** uncompromising fidelity to property rights and his **faith in the free market, those with property and with the wealth to enter the market have the "freedom to choose," in direct proportion to their wealth.** And **at whose expense? Presumably, those without the** tickets (i.e., **cash) to enter the marketplace or to own property. This would include the very young, the very poor, other species, ecosystems, and future generations. Thus it would appear that the libertarian morality embraces the cynic's version of "the golden rule:" "**Those with the gold, get to rule."

### 2ac Util

#### Utilitarianism is the only ethical system

Nielsen 93(Kai, Phil. Prof @ U. Calgary, Absolutism and It Consequentialist Critics, ed. Joram Graf Haber, p. 170-2)

Blowing up the fat man is indeed monstrous. But letting him remain stuck while the whole group drowns is still more monstrous. The consequentialist is on strong moral ground here, and, if his reflective moral convictions do not square either with certain unrehearsed or with certain reflective particular moral convictions of human beings, so much the worse for such commonsense moral convictions. One could even usefully and relevantly adapt here-though for a quite different purpose-an argument of Donagan's. Consequentialism of the kind I have been arguing for provides so persuasive "a theoretical basis for common morality that when it contradicts some moral intuition, it is natural to suspect that intuition, not theory, is corrupt." Given the comprehensiveness, plausibility, and overall rationality of consequentialism, it is not unreasonable to override even a deeply felt moral conviction if it does not square with such a theory, though, if it made no sense or overrode the bulk of or even a great many of our considered moral convictions that would be another matter indeed Anticonsequentialists often point to the inhumanity of people who will sanction such killing of the innocent but cannot the compliment be returned by speaking of the even greater inhumanity, conjoined with evasiveness, of those who will allow even more death and far greater misery and then excuse themselves on the ground that they did not intend the death and misery but merely forbore to prevent it? In such a context, such reasoning and such forbearing to prevent seems to me to constitute a moral evasion. I say it is evasive because rather than steeling himself to do what in normal circumstances would be a horrible and vile act but in this circumstance is a harsh moral necessity he [it] allows, when he has the power to prevent it, a situation which is still many times worse. He tries to keep his 'moral purity' and [to] avoid 'dirty hands' at the price of utter moral failure and what Kierkegaard called 'double-mindedness.' It is understandable that people should act in this morally evasive way but this does not make it right.